

STAFF WORKSHOP
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
West-Wide Energy Corridor) Docket No.
Programmatic EIS)
)
_____)

DOUBLETREE HOTEL
BIG BEAR THEATER
222 NORTH VINEYARD AVENUE
ONTARIO, CALIFORNIA 91764

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2006
10:01 A.M.

Reported by:
Troy A. Ray
Contract No. 150-04-002

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

STAFF PRESENT

Terrence O'Brien

James Bartridge

Roger Johnson

ALSO PRESENT

Don Houston
Semptra Energy

Brent Arnold
Kern River Gas Transmission Company

Lynn Ferry
Southern California Edison Company

David Lawhead
California Department of Parks and Recreation

Polin Mondanlou
County of Orange

Brit Wilson

Gene Frick

Peter Lewandowski
Nevada Hydro Company

Jim Fletcher
Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian
Affairs

Bill Kelly

Jim Haynes

Lisa Northrop

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Overview	1
Project Background - Energy Commission's Role	7
Public Comments	14
D. Houston, Sempra Energy	14
B. Arnold, Kern River Gas Transmission Co.	17
L. Ferry, Southern California Edison Company	20
D. Lawhead, California Department of Parks and Recreation	22
P. Mondanlou, County of Orange	26
G. Frick	27
P. Lewandowski, Nevada Hydro Company	36
J. Fletcher, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs	38
Questions/Discussion	43
Closing Remarks	54
Adjournment	54
Certificate of Reporter	55

P R O C E E D I N G S

10:01 a.m.

MR. O'BRIEN: Good morning. My name is Terry O'Brien and I'm from the Energy Commission. I want to welcome all of you today to today's workshop. I'm gratified at the size of the audience. When we were formulating this workshop we weren't sure how many people we were going to get. But regardless of the size we thought it was a worthwhile thing to do.

I'm here today with two other members of the California State Energy Commission. Over there at the table is Roger Johnson; he is the Siting and Compliance Manager at the Energy Commission. And then Jim Bartridge sitting here in front of me. Jim is the point person and the Project Manager for our work on this project.

I am the Deputy Director at the Energy Commission for Systems Assessment and Facility Siting. In our division we process -- part of the work we do is we process power plant and transmission line applications.

In terms of why we're here today, and Jim will also address this, a portion of our remarks will overlap, but I think that's okay, but

1 why we're here today is in the summer of 2005 the
2 Congress passed the Federal Energy Act. And that
3 requires specified federal agencies, including the
4 Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land
5 Management and the Department of Defense to
6 designate energy corridors on federal land, on
7 federal land in the 11 western states which
8 includes California.

9 And a process has begun by those federal
10 agencies whereby the Department of Energy and the
11 Bureau of Land Management are preparing a
12 programmatic environmental impact statement that
13 will analyze the impacts of energy corridors that
14 will be proposed and designated on federal land in
15 California and the other 11 western states.

16 As I indicated, this is a federal
17 proceeding, so why is the Energy Commission here
18 today, a state agency? And quite simply, it's
19 because state interests are impacted.

20 Our charge at the Energy Commission,
21 which is contained in legislation, state
22 legislation, known as the Warren Alquist Act, is
23 to insure there is a reliable supply of energy in
24 California, while at the same time insuring that
25 while a reliable supply is provided, the public

1 health and safety and the environment are
2 protected.

3 And we want to help insure that these
4 energy corridors that are designated by the
5 federal agencies can provide energy where it is
6 needed, which is predominately in the urban areas
7 of California. While at the same time avoiding
8 any adverse impacts to California's environment or
9 to the citizens' health and safety.

10 Because of our responsibilities for
11 preparing a biennial energy report, and submitting
12 that to the Governor and the Legislature for an
13 enactment of an energy policy, it's also referred
14 to as the Integrated Energy Report, the California
15 State Resources Agency designated the Energy
16 Commission a cooperating agency. And that was
17 ratified by the Bureau of Land Management and the
18 Department of Energy.

19 So we have a special relationship, given
20 those actions, to represent the State of
21 California in this federal effort to designate
22 corridors.

23 Why are we having this workshop today
24 here in Ontario, and tomorrow we will be having a
25 identical workshop in Sacramento. And that's

1 because from our perspective there was a need to
2 provide additional opportunity to these members of
3 the public, to organizations, to interest groups
4 to provide comments on the designation of
5 corridors in California on federal land.

6 We are interested in hearing a wide
7 range from you, and hopefully you represent a wide
8 range of stakeholders, perhaps including local
9 government, energy companies, utilities, public
10 interest groups, environmental organizations. And
11 we're interested in hearing from you in terms of
12 the issues that you think should be considered in
13 the designation of these corridors.

14 The process that was undertaken by the
15 federal agencies, has been undertaken by them,
16 this programmatic EIS; it was noticed in the
17 Federal Register in late September. And then
18 there was a public comment period in November.

19 And a workshop was held in Sacramento to
20 receive public comment on November 1st; and then
21 the period for written comments was extended to
22 November the 28th.

23 And during that written comment period
24 approximately 34 comments were received from
25 various parties regarding the designation of

1 corridors, energy corridors, in California.

2 We had a concern that many interested
3 agencies and groups may not have been aware of the
4 process, and therefore we decided to hold these
5 two workshops to provide further opportunities.

6 Our goal today is to listen to what you
7 have to say regarding suggestions and concerns,
8 and to take this input back to the federal
9 agencies with whom we have been working.

10 I would note that we have been very
11 pleased to date with the cooperative relationship
12 with the federal agencies. I think we're working
13 well together.

14 We have established a working group with
15 different federal and state agencies. On the
16 federal side includes the Bureau of Land
17 Management, the U.S. Forest Service and the
18 Department of Defense. And on the state side, in
19 addition to the Energy Commission, other state
20 agencies that have been involved are the
21 California Public Utilities Commission, the State
22 Lands Commission, the State Clearinghouse and the
23 Department of Parks and Recreation.

24 And we are also in the process of
25 coordinating with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

1 Service and the Department of Fish and Game to get
2 input from them.

3 Based upon our discussion today we will
4 incorporate the issues you raise in our
5 discussions with the federal agencies to insure
6 that appropriate corridors are designated, while
7 at the same time insuring that California's
8 resources and the interests of the state's
9 citizens are taken into account and protected.

10 So that, in a nutshell, is why we're
11 here today. I hope you will find it informative
12 and useful. We certainly look forward later in
13 the session to answering your questions, to
14 hearing your input and hopefully at the end of the
15 day you will leave thinking that this was a
16 worthwhile workshop.

17 And we will certainly, after today's
18 workshop, be available to answer questions. We
19 have a website that Jim will talk about more. And
20 certainly look forward to any further
21 communication as this process proceeds.

22 So, once again, thank you very much.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: Good morning; I'm Jim
25 Bartridge with the Energy Commission. First of

1 all I'd like to say that the maps that you see
2 around the room, they represent stakeholder input
3 from those 34 comments from California to the
4 federal government.

5 So what we did was some extensive GIS
6 mapping to try and lay these things out for you.
7 And they are on the website that we'll talk about
8 in a minute.

9 Next slide. Okay, so today in the
10 PowerPoint I'm going to talk about the Energy
11 Policy Act, the federal scoping process, our
12 outreach efforts, the cooperation that we've been
13 working on, purposes, again. Next steps, where
14 we're going; the programmatic EIS; and then
15 contact information for both myself and BLM.

16 So the Energy Policy Act was signed into
17 law August 8th. This is a very extensive Act and
18 there is a lot of information in it, a lot of
19 separate processes going on besides just this
20 corridor effort.

21 And so this site and the Federal Energy
22 Regulatory Commission, it's the most comprehensive
23 information source I've found yet. So if you have
24 questions about what all is involved in the 2005
25 Energy Policy Act you should definitely take a

1 look at this website.

2 So the Energy Policy Act, section 368,
3 directs agencies to designate corridors for oil
4 and gas and hydrogen pipelines, as well as
5 electric transmission and distribution facilities
6 on federal lands only in 11 western states.

7 To do so they're preparing the
8 programmatic EIS, as required by NEPA. And one
9 note here is that the PEIS does not include tribal
10 lands.

11 These next two slides I put together
12 with the assistance of BLM. We have been reaching
13 out and trying to brief agencies and interest
14 groups, and so Duane helped me put some of these
15 things together as far as what is required.

16 So, as you can see, it's mandated by
17 Congress. No later than August 8, 2007 they have
18 to complete the programmatic environmental impact
19 statement. And as part of that, they'll designate
20 those corridors, perform the environmental reviews
21 and then incorporate designated corridors into the
22 agency land use plans. It's my understanding that
23 the PEIS will actually be the vehicle to
24 incorporate the corridors into land use plans.

25 They have ongoing responsibilities as

1 part of section 368 to insure additional corridors
2 are promptly identified and to expedite
3 applications within such corridors. Now, whether
4 that means there will be another programmatic
5 environmental impact statement later or they're
6 ongoing responsibilities, I'm not clear.

7 And then, of course, they take into
8 account the need for upgraded and new electricity
9 transmission for three purposes. Primarily
10 improve reliability, relieve congestion and
11 enhance the national grid.

12 One thing to note here is that
13 investment in electric transmission nationwide,
14 according to Edison Electric Institute, has
15 declined at a rate of \$100 million a year for the
16 last 25 years. So, at that same time energy sales
17 have doubled. So we're using twice as much and
18 we're not putting as much into the transmission
19 system.

20 Next slide, please. So the notice of
21 intent was published on September 28. It was a
22 90-day comment period. Workshops were held in
23 Sacramento on November 1st. The comment period,
24 as Terry mentioned, closed November 28th. At the
25 November 1st and also in our comments on the 28th

1 we said you guys really need to reach out more to
2 California.

3 So, the Resources Agency then asked us
4 to coordinate California's input to the federal
5 process, as a cooperating agency.

6 Next slide. At that time, as a
7 cooperating agency, we did immediate notification
8 of the pending deadline, the 28th. We notified,
9 through the assistance of the California League of
10 Cities, 478 cities and 58 counties, 48 independent
11 municipal utilities throughout the state, several
12 additional state agencies, and the grid operator.

13 Unfortunately that effort occurred just
14 prior to the Thanksgiving holiday, so people were
15 coming back, seeing this on Monday; had a day or
16 two to submit comments. And so didn't go very
17 far. We heard back also that a lot of the local
18 agencies don't typically look at the Federal
19 Register, so had missed the noticing all together.

20 So in late December and early January we
21 began extensive mapping of these corridors as you
22 can see here. Developed our own website; it went
23 up a week or two ago. And again reached out,
24 notified 478 cities and counties; worked with the
25 Native Heritage Commission to get the list of

1 Native American Tribes and interested parties in
2 California. And then also sent notice out to our
3 electricity list, energy policy, natural gas,
4 renewables and transportation. So we really tried
5 to get the word out that we would be doing
6 additional workshops on this effort.

7 Next slide. So the BLM and the CEC have
8 formed our interagency working group. We've been
9 working now several months trying to assist with
10 identification of corridors within the state,
11 where's appropriate, where's not appropriate. And
12 by working together we're hoping to avoid major
13 conflicts down the line.

14 Federal agencies, you can see, BLM, the
15 Forest Service, National Park Service, Air Force
16 and Marines as Department of Defense. The state
17 agencies are Fish and Game, Parks and Recreation,
18 Public Utilities, State Lands and State
19 Clearinghouse.

20 So, together, we're reviewing corridor
21 proposals and existing infrastructure, land uses,
22 environmental concerns and trying to, again,
23 decide appropriate areas as the federal government
24 moves forward. They're going to take this action
25 anyway, and I think that's why we came to the

1 table was to make sure that they know what's going
2 on in California.

3 And our purpose today is to provide
4 everyone a chance to participate a second time to
5 this EIS process. And we want to hear from you
6 about corridors proposed during the federal
7 scoping period that we've mapped out. Additional
8 corridors or alternatives; renewable resource
9 development areas; environmental and land use
10 issues of concerns, land use is a big issue here;
11 other issues that should be looked at as they move
12 forward.

13 And lastly, if you choose not to speak
14 today, please provide written comments by February
15 16th.

16 MR. WILSON: 2006.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: 2006. Next steps.
18 We're working, this interagency group will meet
19 again in late February and work again on our
20 mapping. And then we meet with the Department of
21 Energy in early March. And then we'll be
22 providing comments from here and tomorrow's
23 workshop, any written correspondence that we
24 receive, and providing them with mapping
25 information.

1 The programmatic EIS, the draft, is
2 expected September or October. I read somewhere
3 in an article the other day that maybe November.
4 So, I think this is a moving target. DOE and BLM
5 are the co-lead federal agencies; the Forest
6 Service and the Energy Commission are cooperating
7 agencies. The contractor is with the Department
8 of Energy, Argonne National Laboratory.

9 And the webpage for the programmatic EIS
10 set up by Argonne is there, listed,
11 corridoreis/anl.gov. So they, at the statewide,
12 or at the nationwide, or in the early stages of
13 identifying corridors across the 11 states now, as
14 that information gets to the borders of California
15 that's where we're trying to come to the table.

16 Next one. Okay, for the purposes of the
17 EIS, a corridor is defined as a preferred location
18 for existing and future utility rights-of-way, and
19 that is suitable for accommodate one or more
20 right-of-ways that are similar, identical or
21 compatible. So this is the definition that they
22 are using for a corridor in the EIS.

23 And finally, contact information. Like
24 to get ahold of either myself or Duane Marti at
25 the BLM, we encourage you to do so. Again,

1 written comments February 16, 2006. And we'll do
2 the best we can to represent your comments, get
3 those across to the federal government so they can
4 be considered in this effort.

5 And with that, I'd like to encourage
6 anyone to come on up. I'll grab the speakers list
7 and we'll read off a few names.

8 MR. JOHNSON: We have all the pdf maps
9 available if anybody wants to call them up and
10 (inaudible).

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Don Horston (sic).

12 MR. HOUSTON: It's Don Houston.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: Houston. With Sempra.

14 MR. HOUSTON: Right. I'm Don Houston
15 with Sempra Energy. I have a prepared statement
16 I'd like to read into the record.

17 Sempra Energy supports the federal
18 government's efforts in designating energy
19 corridors on federal lands to meet the goals
20 established in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

21 We appreciate the California Energy
22 Commission's efforts as a cooperating agency to
23 engage state stakeholders and today's workshop
24 supporting that federal goal.

25 As the economy and population expands,

1 so does our need for energy, both nationally and
2 statewide. Energy industry efforts to more
3 effectively handle the demand side of the energy
4 equation do not preclude the need for additional
5 supplies of energy or the infrastructure necessary
6 to move that energy to customer load centers.

7 Conservation alone will not eliminate
8 the need for those additional supplies and
9 infrastructure.

10 Our expanding economy and population
11 continues to diminish land available for utility
12 infrastructure. In the past several years
13 southern California has experienced substantial
14 residential growth. This growth, coupled with
15 increasing federal, state and local land
16 development restrictions, further limits the
17 availability of feasible and economical energy
18 facility sites.

19 The federal government is California's
20 largest single landowner. Much of this land
21 ownership serves as sites for numerous defense
22 facilities. These defense facilities add an
23 important element to national security and the
24 regional protection and security of energy
25 delivery systems.

1 However, these same beneficial defense
2 facilities, with their large expanses of land, can
3 present a challenge to the location of utility
4 corridors and infrastructure. So, we are
5 encouraged by the participation of the Department
6 of Defense in this federal planning activity.

7 The development of an effective federal
8 energy corridor program is not limited to our
9 national boundaries. To be effective, the
10 corridor must look beyond those boundaries into
11 Mexico. Even though energy projects in Mexico are
12 outside the jurisdiction of the U.S., development
13 of those projects in close proximity to our border
14 may create a need for energy infrastructure
15 facilitating delivery of that energy into the
16 regional energy grid.

17 We encourage the federal government,
18 where appropriate, to engage and work
19 cooperatively on cross-border elements of the
20 corridor plan. The Department of Energy's notice
21 of intent compiled a preliminary list of eight
22 environmental issues that may be analyzed in the
23 programmatic EIS. We believe that the Department
24 of Energy has correctly identified the critical
25 environmental issues for corridor planning.

1 Since corridors for linear energy
2 facilities are relatively flexible in nature, we
3 feel that an effective corridor planning strategy,
4 as envisioned by the Department of Energy, with
5 support from the California Energy Commission,
6 will include adjusting corridors as necessary to
7 mitigate any potential impacts associated with
8 those eight issues.

9 Sempra Energy thanks the California
10 Energy Commission as a cooperating agency in this
11 federal energy corridor planning program, for its
12 efforts in assembling the various stakeholders and
13 sponsoring this workshop.

14 We remain committed to working with the
15 federal government, state government and all
16 affected stakeholders in seeing this innovative
17 and beneficial planning effort to a successful
18 completion.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you, Don. Brent
21 Arnold with Kern River.

22 MR. ARNOLD: Good morning; my name is
23 Brent Arnold; I'm a Senior Environmental
24 Specialist representing Kern River Gas
25 Transmission Company, located in Salt Lake City,

1 Utah.

2 Kern River Gas Transmission Company owns
3 and operates 1679 miles of interstate natural gas
4 pipeline located in Wyoming, Utah, Nevada and
5 California. Approximately 850 miles are located
6 on federally managed lands.

7 Kern River transports a design capacity
8 of 1.7 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas.
9 This transportation, through the existing Kern
10 River system, amounts to approximately 22 percent
11 of the natural gas consumed in California. And
12 when converted to megawatts of electricity, this
13 is enough energy to power approximately 10 million
14 homes.

15 Expansion of the energy transportation
16 system to meet the growing demand for natural gas
17 becomes more difficult without the establishment
18 of effective corridors.

19 Kern River appreciate the opportunity to
20 participate in this public process of this
21 important endeavor being undertaken, as mandated
22 by the Energy Policy Act.

23 The study before us, hopefully resulting
24 in the establishment of better defined and
25 expanded energy corridors is critical to the

1 economy and well being of the western United
2 States.

3 The proposed programmatic environmental
4 impact statement should assess corridors with
5 traditional multiple use principles. Corridors
6 that will accommodate not only electric
7 transmission lines, but pipelines and other energy
8 infrastructures, as well. Corridors should also
9 be established to accommodate not only multiple
10 uses, but multiple facilities. It is essential
11 that these multiple use corridors be established
12 with widths sufficient to meet the expanding needs
13 for energy transportation throughout the western
14 states.

15 Of note and particularly lacking in the
16 proposal before us is the designation of corridors
17 from planning offshore facilities to onshore; and
18 from there, connecting to other designated
19 corridors.

20 Some energy corridors have been
21 established through the land use planning
22 documents on federal lands for years. But an
23 intrinsic flaw in the process excludes corridor
24 establishment on private, state and local lands.
25 The programmatic environmental impact statement

1 should address the establishment of contiguous
2 corridors on a regional basis, taking into account
3 lands that are not federally managed. State,
4 county and city governments must be involved and
5 become firm stakeholders in the process.

6 All too often energy interests are
7 directed and counseled to utilize established
8 corridors, to then realize the fate that
9 eventually the corridor does not exist when
10 federal land interfaces with state, local and
11 urban development.

12 In close, Kern River supports your
13 efforts in the studying and hopefully establishing
14 effective energy corridors in the west.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Lynn Ferry.

17 MS. FERRY: Good morning. My name is
18 Lynn Ferry, that's F, as in Frank, e-r-r-y with
19 Southern California Edison Company.

20 And we appreciate the additional
21 opportunity to provide comments this morning. We
22 did provide oral comments in the previous scoping
23 process, and also written comments, but we intend
24 to file additional written comments by the 16th.

25 And in those written comments we'd like

1 to include a map of our proposed corridors. We
2 just provided a written listing of those
3 corridors, so we thought we would clean it up a
4 little and provide a map, as well, so you can
5 compare that to the maps that you currently have.

6 And we'd also like to provide further
7 comment on the expansion of the existing corridors
8 in California, the expansion of both the length
9 and the width of the corridors that we have
10 designated today should be evaluated.

11 And we would also like to recommend that
12 the corridors be evaluated from a long-term
13 planning perspective, at least 20 years. The
14 corridors need to be held. Transmission siting
15 and planning takes a very long time, and the
16 longer the corridors are held, the better.

17 Edison would also like the CEC and the
18 DOE to consider any designations that corridors be
19 based upon either local, subregional or regional
20 planning processes. That they true up with those
21 actual planning processes and the planning
22 organizations, the proposals that come out of
23 those, as well.

24 And we think it's particularly important
25 that the obligation and the right to build by the

1 incumbent utilities be preserved in those
2 corridors, that each entity within its own service
3 territory should have the right to build on those
4 corridors. Edison has an extremely critical need
5 in meeting our growing load, and we would like
6 those corridors be established for our use within
7 our territory.

8 And also we would like to propose that
9 the CEC roll all of its efforts thus far on the
10 corridor planning into this federal process.

11 Thank you for the opportunity and we
12 will file comments on the 16th, as well.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you. David
14 Lawhead.

15 MR. LAWHEAD: Good morning. My name's
16 Dave Lawhead and I work for the California
17 Department of Parks and Recreation. And in
18 particular, I work out of the Colorado Desert
19 District, Eastern San Diego County, which includes
20 six park units including Anza Borrego Desert State
21 Park, the largest park in the state; actually the
22 largest state-owned park in the country.

23 I have two comments and a question
24 occurred to; I'll put that in at the end about the
25 PEIS.

1 A general comment first. I've sort of
2 been privy to some of the emails that have gone on
3 since State Parks has been involved in your group
4 to look at the project and kind of have their
5 input. And I guess I would like to request that
6 the blackened-in areas, as you call them, the
7 areas that are to be evaluated and hopefully
8 excluded from corridor crossings would include
9 State Park Lands.

10 And the citizens of California have
11 spent many millions of dollars over the years
12 assembling these parks for acquisition; and then
13 many millions more sometimes restoring and
14 managing, monitoring, creating recreational
15 infrastructure and all these things are major
16 investments by the state, and we'd like to
17 maintain that and not see those compromised by
18 having energy corridors pass through the state
19 park lands, which really is contrary to our
20 mission. So, that's my first request.

21 The second is a comment, or a more
22 specific comment regarding the specific corridor
23 that's proposed, the American Wind Energy
24 Association has proposed a corridor, maybe I can
25 point to it, make it simpler.

1 It's this one from (inaudible) straight
2 across through eastern San Diego County. And we
3 would like to see that removed from consideration.
4 That would pass directly through Anza Borrego
5 Desert State Park; not only the state park but
6 state wilderness area.

7 And I realize it's a rather broad
8 corridor, but the park basically runs from
9 Interstate 8 all the way up through Riverside, so
10 no matter where it goes through there it's going
11 to hit that park and potentially (inaudible)
12 Rancho State Park, which is an adjoining park to
13 it, as well, which also has state wilderness in
14 it.

15 So we would ask that that be removed
16 from consideration. We have no plans to
17 disenfranchise or take state wilderness, take
18 lands out of state wilderness designation to
19 accommodate a corridor like that.

20 I guess the other component about, just
21 another comment about Anza Borrego, it's been
22 federally recognized as a national natural
23 landmark. It's also part of the UN Biosphere
24 Preserve System. So both of those really aren't
25 compatible with corridor use.

1 Not only do corridors have direct
2 impacts obviously from the impact to habitats or
3 cultural resources, but in particular, places like
4 Anza Borrego and others, the visual impacts are
5 tremendous. And could never be really adequately
6 mitigated.

7 So, those are my two comments. My
8 question is does the PEIS evaluation actually
9 cover impacts on nonfederal lands that these
10 corridors are designated on. It's only federal
11 lands --

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: It's only federal lands.

13 MR. LAWHEAD: So all this impacts that
14 are being, sort of by default, created to connect
15 the dots between the federal lands across other
16 lands is not being considered in the analysis at
17 all.

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: Again, yeah, this is
19 only on federal lands. And, of course, once they
20 leave federal lands then that would be reviewed
21 under a separate process later down the line. I
22 mean the federal government is trying to do this
23 on their lands, and then once they leave and go
24 onto state lands, it would either be local or
25 Public Utilities Commission permitting. At that

1 point those impacts would be considered through
2 CEQA.

3 MR. LAWHEAD: Okay, thank you.

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: Polin -- I can't say
5 that one. Mondenlou? That's it?

6 MS. MONDENLOU: Yes. I don't have any
7 comments, I was just wondering if since this is
8 new to us, the County of Orange (inaudible) --

9 (Pause.)

10 MS. MONDENLOU: Good morning.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Good morning.

12 MS. MONDENLOU: My name is Polin
13 Mondanlou; I'm with County of Orange, Resources
14 and Development Management Department.

15 This is new to me. Since the comments
16 are due by the 16th of this month and Monday being
17 a holiday, I was wondering if we could get a week
18 extra time, or perhaps, if you have any
19 comments --

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: I'd say go ahead and
21 prepare your comments and submit them as soon as
22 you can. And if --

23 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- the 17th or the 20th,
25 you know, -- again, I'm meeting with the

1 Department of Energy early March, so I'm trying to
2 gather all these comments up and have time to. So
3 if you submit them I'll try and get them in.

4 MS. MONDENLOU: Wonderful, thank you.

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: Brit Wilson.

6 MR. WILSON: I don't need to speak; I
7 just signed in. I didn't realize that was a
8 speaker list.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Oh, okay.

10 MR. WILSON: My apologies.

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay, well, anybody
12 else? Would anybody else like to comment? Please
13 come on up, state your name in the microphone.

14 MR. FRICK: My name is Gene Frick. I
15 live in the City of Riverside. And I'm a forest
16 activist. I want to thank you for holding this.
17 I agree that given the importance and the size of
18 this project it is relatively little known. And,
19 if possible, I would suggest you do this one more
20 time.

21 It's my understanding that comments on a
22 DEIS can go into the record at anytime, but that
23 the comments do not have to be replied to in the
24 DEIS as to comments that are submitted in a timely
25 fashion.

1 I'm basically asking questions here and
2 I would appreciate it if you would put a little
3 section on your webpage that would deal with
4 things that are not particularly germane to the
5 DEIS, itself, in terms of comments of what its
6 content will be, but other things outside the
7 process basically.

8 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

9 MR. FRICK: Okay. So, my next question
10 is along that line. My understanding is that this
11 is going to end up with a change in management
12 plans, which I think will require a regular
13 decision issued by the particular land manager.

14 There will be at least two, BLM and
15 Forest Services --

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Forest Service.

17 MR. FRICK: -- and I believe that they
18 both have a different appeal process. I assume
19 that appeals will be possible.

20 You don't have to answer these questions
21 now --

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: I don't know the answer
23 to that. Yeah.

24 MR. FRICK: I would just like to see
25 someplace on your webpage where these questions

1 are answered.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

3 MR. FRICK: So, if there's going to be a
4 special appeal process or if there's going to be a
5 regular mandated appeal process, I'd like to know
6 that.

7 The other thing is that you've talked
8 several times, or people have mentioned the
9 question of things being necessary. Necessity, in
10 terms of energy projects, be it transmission lines
11 or pipelines, require a study. So in order to
12 know, for instance, that a transmission line is
13 necessary there has to be a power study on the
14 grid that it's going to hook into. And what I
15 want to know is the DEIS going to include these
16 power studies. And if so, who's going to do it.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: I know that under a
18 separate Act, section 1221, they are doing a
19 westwide, the Western Electricity Coordinating
20 Council, they're doing a congestion study to
21 identify congestion that's existing on the system.
22 So that would also feed this effort and point out
23 where corridors are needed.

24 Again, when it gets to actual permitting
25 for a line, I mean corridors is one thing, it's

1 the land use component --

2 MR. FRICK: Right.

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- that's necessary.

4 When they actually get to the permitting of a line
5 that may go into a corridor five years out or
6 eight years out, they'd have to do the appropriate
7 studies at that time, whether it be CEQA or Cal-
8 ISO's --

9 MR. FRICK: My understanding of a
10 designation for a transmission line or a pipeline,
11 say, through national forest, is that that
12 designation is in place it impacts the management
13 plan for that particular area.

14 For instance, any proposals for special
15 set-asides within the forest, say, study areas or
16 wilderness designations, those sort of things.

17 Once that designation for a transmission
18 line exists, that inhibits other parts of the
19 management plan. That's my understanding. These
20 are basically questions I'm asking --

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure.

22 MR. FRICK: -- and I'd like to see some
23 answers to them. I don't expect answers today.
24 If that's the case, then a designation, I think,
25 should not exist unless it has been shown to be

1 necessary.

2 So, if the management plan comes out and
3 says this is a designated corridor contingent on
4 other approvals, so that it would not impact the
5 management plan, then I think it would be all
6 right. Otherwise, I think you have to do the
7 power studies to show that the designation is
8 necessary. Just an opinion.

9 Okay, normally in these kind of
10 processes where this sort of thing is going on
11 there's a -- we obviously haven't had time to do
12 rulemaking under the Act, there wasn't time to do
13 it. But normally where this kind of process goes
14 on there's an ex parte limitation in terms of
15 communication with decisionmakers.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think you --

17 MR. FRICK: And what I'm worried about,
18 of course, is that we all know that people try to
19 use as much influence as they can. I would not
20 like to see big energy companies coming in.

21 This, of course, would inhibit other
22 agencies like the Sierra Club. I just want to
23 know if it's going to be there.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: You know, we have to
25 follow up with the Department of Energy --

1 MR. FRICK: I understand, I --

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- process-wise.

3 MR. FRICK: -- these are basically
4 questions I'm asking, and these are basically
5 process questions.

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure.

7 MR. FRICK: And I would like to see some
8 answers to the process questions.

9 The other thing is since there has not
10 been a lot of notification I want to know if
11 there's going to be an intent to notify landowners
12 that will be impacted by route designations
13 through public lands. In other words, if there's
14 a route designation through public land at end
15 somewhere, and right next to that is a private
16 property owner. Will private property owners be
17 notified that they're going to be right next to a
18 designated corridor?

19 This is technical in these kinds of
20 projects where property owners are given
21 notification that they are ordering on a project.

22 The other question I have is both the
23 Department of Homeland Security and FERC have what
24 is known as critical infrastructure information
25 rules. I want to know if any of these maps, for

1 instance, are put into that system, how are we
2 going to get the information back out. I think
3 FERC and DHS kind of spells that out, but I want
4 to know if there's going to be a special one for
5 this process.

6 And in the rest of the Act there's a
7 question about expediting actual projects. And
8 it's not clear to me. I know that FERC has, in
9 another part of the Energy Act, there's a
10 provision for FERC to actually license
11 transmission lines if states fail to act in the
12 question where there is a necessary transmission
13 line for reliability of the grid.

14 And I think that's what you were
15 referring to. FERC is going through a process
16 right now --

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, there's stuff that
18 says --

19 MR. FRICK: -- that's set up by
20 unified -- a uniform reliability standard for the
21 whole United States, so that they can apply the
22 same standard to the entire grid.

23 And I forget what states they're in. I
24 don't think they passed the rule yet, but I think
25 they're close to it.

1 Once they do, part of the Energy Act
2 says that FERC will have the capability to do
3 transmission lines. Now, I'd like to see that
4 spelled out in terms of, you know, how long are --
5 because there's going to be awhile before the FERC
6 rule's in place.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Sure.

8 MR. FRICK: So basically what I'd like
9 to know is what this expedite means.

10 And I think one other comment I think I
11 would like to see done, and I'll put this in
12 written comments, because of the critical
13 infrastructure information on a thing that both
14 DHS and FERC have done, they have said that
15 transmission lines are particularly critical to
16 the, you know, to the economy and actually the
17 health and welfare of the country, which is why
18 they called them critical information.

19 And the rules -- in the Federal Register
20 where they promulgated those rules, they
21 emphasized that one of the things we're going to
22 do is reduce risk to the country. And that's why
23 they want to control exact locations of both
24 pipelines and transmission lines.

25 It seems to me, from a terrorist point

1 of view, is that what we're doing here is creating
2 targets. And what I'd like to see is something
3 that I don't think has been done before, and that
4 is that on the DEIS, in terms of alternative
5 considerations and alternative evaluations, the
6 Department of Homeland Security has a branch that
7 does risk evaluation. Look at alternative to
8 proposed transmission lines from the point of view
9 of reducing risk.

10 And I can just give you one small idea
11 of what that might mean. If you were a terrorist
12 looking at this as a target, and it was put up in
13 the national forest, you could drive a bunch of
14 trucks up there essentially unobserved, unload a
15 whole bunch of dynamite so that you could knock
16 over towers.

17 If the transmission lines were along
18 freeways you would always have eyes watching. So,
19 from the point of view of reliability from
20 terrorism, I would say the preferred alternatives
21 would be urban infrastructures would be in urban
22 areas. But I will elaborate that more later.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you. Anyone else
25 like to speak? State your name and --

1 MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you. My name is
2 Peter Lewandowski. I'm a Representative of the
3 Nevada Hydro Company. Nevada Hydro Company and
4 the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District are
5 joint applicants on Federal Energy Regulatory
6 Commission project 11858, also known as the Lake
7 Elsinore advanced pump storage project.

8 The Lake Elsinore advanced pump storage
9 project, or LEAPS, in conjunction with its
10 transmission line, identified as the Talega
11 Escondido Valley Sorranos 500 kV interconnect are
12 also applicants for a special use permit
13 application being processed through the United
14 States Forest Service.

15 We have submitted written comments to
16 you today which we request be included in the
17 project's administrative record.

18 Relative to the status of our project,
19 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in
20 conjunction with the United States Forest Service,
21 will be releasing a draft environmental impact
22 statement for a project-level decisionmaking for
23 those two projects on February 17th.

24 Relative to your timeframe, February
25 16th, we request the opportunity to submit late

1 comments, including the submission of the FERC
2 U.S. Forest Service project level EIS for your
3 consideration.

4 As we review the maps on the wall today,
5 although we have submitted comments to the
6 Department of Energy in response to their
7 solicitation for comments on the 368 process, we
8 notice that the transmission line associated to
9 LEAPS and the TEVS interconnect are not
10 represented on your maps presented today.

11 It is requested, therefore, that as you
12 continue this process, that you update the maps to
13 include the transmission lines which we've
14 identified which will interconnect on the north,
15 Southern California Edison facility, and on the
16 south, San Diego Gas and Electric facility;
17 transversing the Cleveland National Forest, Bureau
18 of Land Management lands and lands administered by
19 the United States Marine Corps and associated with
20 Camp Pendleton.

21 Our transmission line is either totally
22 or predominately located on federal lands, and
23 it's clearly eligible for consideration as part of
24 the 368 process.

25 The Nevada Hydro Company and the

1 Elsinore Valley Water District request that the
2 California Energy Commission consider as part of
3 their response to the Department of Energy the
4 support for the LEAPS and the TEVS interconnect
5 line.

6 Thank you very much.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other comments?

8 MR. FLETCHER: Good morning. My name is
9 Jim Fletcher; I work for the Department of the
10 Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. I'm the
11 Superintendent of the Southern California Agency.

12 I currently have 29 tribes under my
13 jurisdiction. And we manage a little bit over a
14 quarter-million acres in southern California for
15 our tribes. The agency is an obscure one. We're
16 located with Interior, and our sister agency, BLM.

17 And most of our tribes occupy lands in
18 San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino and Santa
19 Barbara Counties in this area.

20 And looked at the notice of outreach and
21 I just became aware of this proposal just
22 recently, myself. And I know that my tribes, I
23 have one tribal representative here, hopefully --
24 I don't know if (inaudible) but Morongo is here,
25 because they have several interests.

1 And the corridors that are proposed and
2 that exist currently travel through some of my
3 reservations. And it's important to know that, be
4 aware of that. And to understand to reach out to
5 some of these tribes, specifically that have these
6 identified corridors; meet with them and discuss
7 with them about the issues that we're talking
8 about today.

9 Because a lot of the tribes are growing
10 governmental functions and get paper. And a lot
11 of paper goes into the can, because it's not
12 important to them. They don't understand
13 sometimes that those impacts have some serious
14 ones. And so you need to reach out more than just
15 sending a letter to the tribes.

16 I know that in a couple of my tribes'
17 instances, two of the large energy companies have
18 come to the tribes and talked to them about some
19 new corridors and some new lines going through.
20 And they're meeting with a couple of my tribes
21 right now. But it's important.

22 We currently have under operation right
23 now 50 megawatts of greenpower in San Diego
24 through a wind energy project, 25 two-megawatt
25 wind generators on Capital Indian Reservation.

1 And cannot put any more power into the grid at
2 that point because the lines are just max'd out.
3 And there's no method of generating an additional
4 1- to 2- or 300 megawatts of wind power in that
5 area from four of my tribes in that area to
6 deliver, because there's no way to get it into San
7 Diego or get it anywhere else. The infrastructure
8 just does not exist.

9 And so how do we do that? And the cost
10 for the tribes to try and develop that is
11 phenomenal. It's beyond their capability to do
12 that.

13 Important to note in mind that these
14 corridors that are proposed, not all of my 29
15 tribes are going to be in favor of that. Each one
16 is an individual government. They each decide,
17 even though you and the United States holds that
18 land in trust for those tribes to inure to their
19 benefit, each tribe makes its own decisions. And
20 each tribe operates differently. No two tribes
21 operate the same way. It's just a function of
22 their government and the way that they deal with
23 those things.

24 And so, again, where you have those
25 corridors, where you have that expansion out there

1 in southeastern San Diego County at the Tecate
2 Divide where wind energy generation is important
3 out there, because I saw on most of the maps it
4 doesn't show it, but it does exist. And we are
5 delivering power to Semptra and to San Diego Gas
6 and Electric through that.

7 And want to encourage you as much as
8 possible to reach out to those affected tribes,
9 and any of those potential corridors that exist,
10 because there are a lot of rumors out there in
11 Indian country, and the moccasin telegraph works
12 very well.

13 We're hearing, I mean some of my tribes
14 have called me already and saying, are these
15 corridors, if they come through the reservation do
16 they have to come to the tribes. And, of course,
17 the answer is yes. And do they have to negotiate
18 right-of-ways, yes. It's not just that.

19 And it's important that we need to find
20 them, that you work with these groups. Because if
21 you don't work with these tribes and they don't
22 understand what they're doing, or if they're
23 opposed to it, you're going to build a corridor
24 that's going to stop at the reservation and it's
25 not going to go through.

1 Because there's no method to put a
2 corridor through a reservation on tribal land
3 short of an Act of Congress. And those tribes
4 have that inherent right to determine their future
5 and do that.

6 And so I encourage all of you to reach
7 out and understand that better. And we plan on
8 becoming more involved in this process, as well.
9 I'm not sure what our role is going to be because
10 our tribes, we represent their interest.

11 In the old days -- the Bureau of Indian
12 Affairs is the oldest Bureau in the United States
13 Government. We were established in 1824 under the
14 Department of War. And that leads to treaties and
15 treaty negotiations; and that's how the government
16 deals with them. The tribes under our
17 jurisdiction have choices. They don't have to
18 deal with the State of California. They don't
19 have to deal with the local governments. The only
20 ones they have to deal with is the federal
21 government if they choose to do so.

22 But they play an important role. As I
23 said, they're developing greenenergy there. I
24 have another tribe out in the desert area that's
25 looking at construction of a power plant, itself,

1 of some sort. And they're considering that right
2 now.

3 So it's important that we work together
4 in order to make these things work. And just
5 wanted to relate that to you, and the importance
6 of getting out to my tribes, especially those in
7 the potentially affected corridors. And meeting
8 with them and having discussions, and I would be
9 glad to facilitate that.

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: Thank you.

11 MR. FLETCHER: All right, thank you.

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other comments
13 today?

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think that's it, then.
16 Okay. Well, we can open it up for questions and
17 answers at this point then unless anybody else
18 would like to make another comment. Okay.

19 So, go ahead.

20 MS. NORTHROP: -- didn't come in for the
21 stakeholder maps? Was it just provided by the
22 individual company, or was it outreach from the
23 Energy Commission, or how was the data derived?

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: Initially these are
25 comments that were submitted to the federal

1 government during scoping. So some of them have
2 maps to them. And then we sat down and did the
3 GIS mapping based on the comments that were
4 submitted.

5 MS. NORTHROP: So, oral -- I mean for
6 example, the (inaudible)?

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: The SDG&E stuff, SDG&E
8 submitted a letter requesting certain
9 considerations, certain areas. They have an
10 ongoing project that's going into permitting now.
11 We went to the Sunrise Power link, so we actually
12 went to their website and recreate that to put
13 that on the map so that folks had an idea; rather
14 than leave that empty.

15 So that's based on their Sunrise Power
16 link community studies or their outreach efforts.

17 MR. KELLY: Percentage-wise, how many of
18 these are new corridors versus existing corridors
19 (inaudible)?

20 MR. O'BRIEN: Can you make it a little
21 bit bigger, Roger?

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: What you can see on here
23 in the orange and I --

24 MR. O'BRIEN: Hold on, wait a second,
25 maybe you should dim the lights.

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- take a look at our
2 website --

3 MR. O'BRIEN: Jim, would you ask him to
4 come to the microphone if he has a question?

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, if you have a
6 question please come up to the microphone and
7 state your question so that we can get it on the
8 record.

9 For the federal corridors, the existing
10 are orange on these maps. That's BLM. Now,
11 trying to capture all of them, there's some orange
12 over here, and then other existing corridors of
13 the U.S. Forest Service are here. And some others
14 on the statewide.

15 So the majority of what you see has been
16 proposed.

17 MR. KELLY: (inaudible).

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, we do. The second
19 one, BLM/USFS. So you can see in the northern
20 part of the state, it gets a little confusing with
21 all of the lines on there, but these are the
22 existing corridors for BLM, part of the desert
23 southwest; and then you can see some existing
24 corridors here, the U.S. Forest Service through
25 their various forests; and then some others to the

1 north. So these are existing corridors, as well.

2 That's what we have in California.

3 Everything else you see on the map has been
4 proposed.

5 Go ahead.

6 MR. HAYNES: Is all this part of a
7 national master plan, not only the 11 states, but
8 other states?

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes. As part of the
10 Energy Policy Act they were told to do the 11
11 western states first, and everything else
12 afterwards.

13 MR. HAYNES: So, we're priority, I
14 guess?

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think we are priority.

16 MR. HAYNES: Okay.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: I think there's a lot
18 going on out here and a lot of issues.

19 MR. HAYNES: Okay, thank you.

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: Um-hum.

21 MR. O'BRIEN: In response to that
22 question my guess would be -- I could be wrong
23 about this -- is that if you look at the 11
24 western states, the federal government is a huge
25 landholder.

1 As you move further east in the country,
2 federal ownership diminishes greatly. So there
3 may have been a belief that it would be easier to
4 do federal corridor designation in the 11 western
5 states since so much of those states has land
6 that's owned by the federal government.

7 MR. LAWHEAD: I'm just curious how the
8 winnowing down process proceeds here as far as --
9 I mean are all those proposed corridors going to
10 go into the programmatic document? Or is there
11 going to be a review and a winnowing down and a
12 prioritization of them?

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: As the agencies, we're
14 working together in California to provide this
15 input, so we're going to be meeting in the next
16 couple weeks to sort of outline, like you
17 mentioned, black areas or areas that we don't
18 think it's appropriate.

19 Now how DOE is actually getting there
20 with the information, I'm not clear. I haven't
21 seen the draft information that they're proposing
22 yet. This is what's been proposed to them;
23 they're working on the EIS. They'll present draft
24 corridors to us at some point.

25 We'll match that up with what we're

1 looking at and say, does this or doesn't this
2 work, or what about these areas.

3 So, yeah, as the process continues I
4 think, over the summer.

5 MR. LAWHEAD: Will that process be going
6 on before it goes out for a draft public review of
7 a document? Or is this going to be you'll have
8 your chance to comment after they produce a
9 document?

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, you'll have
11 another chance to --

12 MR. LAWHEAD: I'm talking about
13 internally with you and the state and your
14 discussions with them about prioritizing --

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: No, our -- we'll be
16 having, again, the interagency group meets in
17 February. Then we meet with DOE. They have a
18 mandated timeline that we have to meet.

19 As we got on board the last thing we
20 wanted to do was derail what they're doing so that
21 they don't come work with us again.

22 MR. LAWHEAD: Thank you. Anyone else?
23 Any questions whatsoever? Come on up and state
24 your name. Go ahead.

25 MR. FRICK: Gene Frick, I was here

1 before. About implementing projects, I raised the
2 question whether or not FERC was going to be
3 involved in that under the parts of the Energy
4 Act, but is it anticipated that the normal state
5 processes will be used?

6 In other words, if a utility has a
7 corridor and proposes a project it'll go through
8 the CPUC. If, for instance, IID has their own
9 method for undoing transmission lines. Will all
10 the processes for approving projects be the same
11 as they are now?

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: To my understanding they
13 will. I mean, again, this is on federal land, so
14 if it's a process here like IID, they do their own
15 permitting. They would move forward with their
16 own permitting.

17 If it was a larger project proposed by
18 CPUC or, you know, it would go through CPUC
19 processing.

20 Again, this is on designation only of
21 the corridor, so it's not specific to --

22 MR. FRICK: No, I understand --

23 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- the projects.

24 MR. FRICK: -- but the second part of
25 368 does say that projects should be expedited and

1 does talk about actually doing projects.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: And you mentioned
3 earlier, it does talk about the backstop siting
4 authorities with FERC. So I'm not clear, the way
5 it's laid out it says if the state can't
6 accomplish, or the normal permitting process can't
7 accomplish within some amount of time, then the
8 applicant can go to FERC.

9 MR. FRICK: But as you're well area,
10 there's a whole process going on within California
11 about how the transmission lines will be approved.

12 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

13 MR. FRICK: And I wonder if that's going
14 to fold into this process.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah, I sit right across
16 from the guy that's working on that, so we're
17 pretty in tune.

18 MR. O'BRIEN: I would say the answer to
19 your question is it's no, to the extent that the
20 process we have in front of us is the federal
21 government saying, okay, we want to designate
22 corridors on federal lands. And that decision,
23 once it's made, it implies that whatever type of
24 energy project, whether it be a hydrogen pipeline
25 or electric transmission line, would presumably be

1 a compatible land use within those corridor
2 designations.

3 After that takes place, if an entity
4 were to propose a project, let's say a utility,
5 whether that be investor-owned utility or
6 municipal utility, then whoever the applicant was
7 in that case, they have to go through the
8 identified regulatory process.

9 Currently if it was, for example,
10 Southern California Edison, they'd have to go to
11 the Public Utilities Commission. If it was the
12 Imperial Irrigation District they would act as
13 their own lead agency under the California
14 Environmental Quality Act.

15 To the extent that their transmission
16 line would be in a federal corridor, the federal
17 agency, BLM, U.S. Forest Service, would also be
18 probably a lead agency. And you might prepare a
19 joint environmental document if, in fact, the line
20 then crossed out of federal land and into private
21 land or state land, for example.

22 You raised a question earlier about this
23 issue of what FERC is doing. They're trying to
24 determine national interest electric transmission
25 line corridors. That process is going on right

1 now in terms of doing transmission congestion
2 studies to identify what transmission lines are
3 currently congested.

4 The concern on the part of the federal
5 government when they passed that portion of this,
6 you know, huge Federal Energy Act was that if, in
7 fact, there are transmission lines, electric
8 transmission lines that are congested, and if the
9 states, in terms of their permitting authority,
10 did not move fast enough, the federal government
11 could come in, under this Act, and preempt state
12 authority.

13 Now, from a state perspective, we find
14 that troublesome. But that's the law. We're
15 providing input, the Energy Commission is, in
16 terms of these studies to identify congestion.
17 Doing that work doesn't mean that we support the
18 fact that there ought to be federal preemption if,
19 in fact, FERC believes the state agencies are
20 moving too slowly from a permitting standpoint.

21 MR. FRICK: Thank you.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Any other comments or
23 questions? Come on up.

24 MR. LAWHEAD: Just something else
25 occurred to me. I was curious if this proceeds to

1 a certain end point and we end up with a number of
2 new corridors, does that pretty much then drive
3 where any new generation is going to go?

4 I mean is that being analyzed, as well,
5 as far as it's got to hook up to the system. So
6 this is going to predetermine where that's going
7 to happen? That's a question, not a statement.

8 MR. O'BRIEN: I think to the extent that
9 corridors have been proposed by private entities,
10 you know, developers, municipals, you know,
11 investor-owned utilities, that's based in part on
12 the expectation that in certain areas, whether
13 within California or outside of California,
14 there's likely to be new generation.

15 So, for example, if you look at parts of
16 California where renewable resources might be
17 developed, for example solar power or geothermal
18 power, transmission line corridors have probably
19 been put forward that anticipate the development
20 of those resources.

21 But, having said that, in terms of what
22 we are doing in looking at these corridors, we're
23 not then taking a step back and -- well, we aren't
24 trying to identify locations, per se, for
25 generation. But we're cognizant of taking into

1 account that, particularly for renewables, given
2 the fact that they're normally located in more
3 remote areas, that has to be a factor when you're
4 looking at what corridors to designate.

5 And certainly doesn't apply for fossil-
6 fired generation, though there may be some
7 proposed corridors through some of the western
8 states that would come into California that are
9 based upon an expectation perhaps on the
10 development of large, of fossil-fired generation,
11 whether that be natural gas or coal, for example.

12 MR. LAWHEAD: Thanks.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: Anyone else? No.

14 Okay, well, with that we'll close the
15 workshop. Again, I encourage you to get any
16 written comments in, if you can make it by
17 February 16th, or soon thereafter. As soon as you
18 can get them to me, please.

19 And thank everyone for coming out today.

20 (Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the workshop
21 was adjourned.)

22 --o0o--

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, TROY A. RAY, an Electronic Reporter,
do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person
herein; that I recorded the foregoing California
Energy Commission Staff Workshop; that it was
thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of
counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said
workshop, nor in any way interested in outcome of
said workshop.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 15th day of February, 2006.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345